

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-10, and 13 are currently pending in this application. By this response to the Office Action mailed on January 21, 2010, claims 1, 5, 7, 10, and 13 are amended. Support for the amendments is found, for example, in page 12, lines 2-13 of the specification and claim 4, as originally filed. Independent claims 1, 10, and 13 are amended to, *inter alia*, incorporate limitations previously recited in claim 4. Claims 5 and 7 are amended to revise claim dependencies. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully solicited.

In section 1 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,509,974 (Hansen). In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen. Applicants respectfully traverse.

First, amended independent claims 1, 10, and 13 each recite, *inter alia*,

... image recording media recorded with images ...
 ... designating attributes of the image recording media constituting finally
 resulting matter resulting due to processing based on the workflow to be created
 ...
 the attributes designated as attributes of the image recording media ...
 include at least one of the type of image recording media to be made as the finally
 resulting matter, number of items, size, variety of colors, presence or absence of a
 trap, and imposition method.

Accordingly, the recited “attributes” are attributes for the media upon which images are recorded – not the images recorded thereon. FIGS. 7, 9, and 14 of this application illustrate examples of such attributes.

The features in Hansen relied upon by the Office Action do not disclose, or otherwise render obvious, the recited “attributes of the image recording media.” Page 4, lines 3-7 of the

Office Action concludes that Hansen, col. 6, lines 20-60 discloses the recited “designating attributes of the image recording media.” The cited portion of Hansen describes:

. . . offering services to the customer. Such services include the ability to modify documents provided by the customer. Such features include adding page numbers across multiple documents, bates numbering, adjusting page layout for tab stock and aligning the output to account for binding. . . . removing artifacts in scanned images and masking over unwanted text or markings. . . . shifting image slightly when performing the signature imposition on the document. . . . manage and layout the document pages for final output, also known as “imposition” and “signature imposition”. In addition, the operator can shuffle pages, reverse pages, insert blank pages, trim and shift pages, create bleeds and place multiple pages on a sheet, also known as “n-up” to create proof sets, brochures or pamphlets, etc. Further the job preparation station 116 permits the operator to add annotations to the document such as bates numbers, page numbers, logos and watermarks. . . . Such alterations to the document are known as document/page features or attributes.

However, the above “alterations to the document” in Hansen are attributes for allowing the operator to manage and layout the document image contents for final output, and do not teach the recited “attributes of the image recording media.” In contrast, the “attributes of the image recording media” recited in claim 1 does not include the above items designated by the operator in Hansen’s system. So, in embodiments of the claimed subject matter, a workflow is created without designating these items the operator has to designate in Hansen’s system.

Second, amended independent claims 1, 10, and 13 each recite, *inter alia*,

display[ing] a plurality of icons indicating the respective attributes selectable for the image recording media constituting the finally resulting matter at the display . . .

register[ing] an attribute indicated by a selected icon as an output requirement when one of the plurality of icons is selected due to an operation of [a] pointing device.

Page 5 of the Office Action incorrectly concludes that these limitations, previously presented in claim 4, are disclosed by Hansen. Hansen does not disclose that icons indicating the attributes of the image recording media are displayed and are operated by a user. Instead,

Hansen's attributes are the matters which are specified by tools to support electronic versions of tickets (Hansen, col. 11, line 64 -- col. 12, line 2). In Hansen, although tickets are visually represented, information regarding the attributes is not visually represented.

For at least the above reasons, Hansen does not disclose or render obvious the subject matter recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, and 13. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under Sections 102 and 103.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the Examiner's favorable reconsideration as to allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eric M. Shelton

Registration No. 57,630

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 EMS:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: April 21, 2010

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**